

Attachment 5

## Proposed Talking Points

## Item 1: Whether or not to approve the revised approach whereby two separate reports will be proposed for the President on Space Station and National Space Strategy.

- The decision on the Space Station is logically a part of the National Space Strategy decisions. Its costs are very high and it will have major (direct and indirect) impacts on national security space programs.
- A positive decision on the Space Station (while simultaneously considering cuts in the national security space budgets) might send the wrong signal to Congress about our priorities.
- We do not see an urgent need for a Presidential decision on this issue in September.
- Given the above, we would prefer to see a delay in Presidential consideration of this issue, but we are prepared to accept the IG(Space) recommendations.

## Item 2: Agency views on Space Station Report.

- The report would be improved if there was an attempt to close the gap between the widely divergent viewpoints expressed in the pros and cons. Supporting data and analysis are lacking.
- The relationship of the report to National Space Strategy is not included. A short reference of this relationship should be added to the preface.
- On balance, we find the report marginally acceptable. The Drafting Group should incorporate major substantive comments from the SIG(Space) members.

## Item 3: Preferred Space Station option for the President's consideration.

- Option 1 is premature and has high risk associated with projected costs and competition for scarce resources.
- NASA focus on a Space Station could detract from support for the Shuttle.
- The decision should be made within the context of other major civil and national security space decisions. Presidential approval of this initiative (while simultaneously considering cuts in national security space budgets) would send the wrong signal to Congress.
- Option 2 would be more acceptable to us than Option 1, but we do not feel that it has been examined in sufficient depth.
- We support Option 3. It would give us time for additional definition of requirements and design concepts so that better definition of costs and risks could be made.

